

Mr. Bunn

This document contains 3 pages.

Page 3 of 10, Section A

~~SECRET-LIMDIS~~~~SECRET LIMDIS~~

January 17, 1967

(Prepared by JR 7)

**FURTHER QUESTIONS RAISED BY THE FRG WITH REGARD TO
INTERPRETATION OF THE DRAFT TEXT OF THE NPT**

The following questions were provided orally by Mr. von Staden to an ACDA officer at 3:30, Jan. 17. They were translated from a German-language instruction during the course of presentation. They are to be considered only as oral questions provided informally to the American side to facilitate preparation of answers. Ambassador Knappstein will have the official English-language translation of the questions for presentation during the meeting tomorrow.]

1. Whether and how has the Soviet side, in the different talks you have had with them, spoken out concerning the question of whether consultations are to be permitted under the terms of the draft Non-Proliferation Treaty? (Question prompted by the fact that the subject was raised inter alia in the Brezhnev speech of January 13 in Gorki.)

2. (We were told at the last meeting between the Ambassador and Mr. Foster that consultation would be permitted as long as it does not lead to or constitute transfer of weapons or control over weapons and in this connection Mr. Foster mentioned that control means decision to fire.) Question is whether this kind of definition of the word "control" is understood or accepted by the Soviet side?

3. Whether it is the American understanding of the draft that changes in existing nuclear arrangements remain possible or permissible; for instance, changes consisting in exchanging new for older weapons, or changes which may prove to be desirable or necessary in the future because of technical developments?

DECLASSIFIED BY/

RELEASE AUTHORITY: PAUL HILBURN, SENIOR REVIEWER

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE

RELEASE DECISION: RELEASE IN FULL

DATE: JANUARY 8, 2020

~~SECRET-LIMDIS~~~~SECRET LIMDIS~~

GROUP 1

Excluded from automatic

downgrading and

declassification

~~SECRET-LIMDIS~~

- 2 -

4. Whether during talks with the Soviets, the Soviet side stated any opinions on those U.S. interpretations which were contained in the oral note on January 13 with regard to the European option? More specifically, is there any indication that the Soviets might consider the treaty violated should several European countries concert with a view to establishing a European union with a central political authority and a common foreign and defense policy?

5. Could a European defense community which would be created as an intermediate step toward political union possess all kinds of delivery vehicles (strategic and tactical), such as missile launchers, etc. What in particular is the U.S. position with regard to those weapons in which the nuclear warheads and carriers can not be separated (such as Polaris)?

6. (It is the German understanding that nuclear weapons for purposes of the Treaty means only the warheads.) Is this the understanding of what constitutes a nuclear weapon acceptable to the Soviets, and what does this definition mean with regard to the case where warheads and carriers can not be separated?

7. Whether, in the U.S. view, ADMs are purely defensive weapons?

8. Did the question of possible FRG right of veto over foreign owned nuclear weapons on German soil come up in talks with Soviets and if so did they voice any opinions?

9. During the talks with the Soviets, did they voice any opinion on possible limitations to cooperation in the field of peaceful nuclear research and industry (apart from nuclear explosives) as a consequence of the treaty? Can it be firmly stated that full and unlimited participation in peaceful development in the field of nuclear research and industry (apart from peaceful explosives) is assured after the treaty is signed?

~~SECRET-LIMDIS~~

~~SECRET-LINDIS~~

- 3 -

10. (Article IV of the draft text stipulates that after five years a conference should examine whether the purposes and provisions of the treaty have been realized.) Does the word "purpose" in this article refer to a preambular clause of the treaty and in such case, what is the wording of such a preambular clause?

~~SECRET-LINDIS~~